

Appl. No. 09/822,167
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

REMARKS

I. CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-33 were pending. Claims 6 and 23 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 12, 17, 20, 24, 26, and 31 have been amended. Claim 34 has been added. Claims 1-5, 7-22, 24-34 are therefore pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled dependent claim 6 and to clarify the intended claim scope.

Claims 7 and 24 have been amended to alter their dependency from canceled claims.

Claims 12, 17, 26, and 31 have been amended into independent form. The claim scopes are unaltered by these amendments.

Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 23. The claim scope is unchanged relative to the canceled claim.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 20, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205 ("Carcerano"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections insofar as they may apply to the pending claims because the cited art fails to teach each element of the claims as is required for rejections of this type.

Claims 3, 5, and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carcerano in view of U.S. Patent App. 2001/0032273 ("Cheng"). Claims 16 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carcerano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,372 ("Yamaura"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections insofar as they may apply to the pending claims because the cited art fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the claims as is required for rejections of this type.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites "receiving a synchronization request from an electronic device that is to be configured in accordance with the configuration information; and providing device configuration information from the database to the electronic device in response to the synchronization request." To anticipate this limitation, the examiner cites

Appl. No. 09/822,167
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

Carcerano at col. 9, lines 33-61, where Carcerano describes the relationships between workstation 70, browser 83, HTTP server 103, database 105, CGI scripts 106, and templates 107. The cited art (Carcerano, Cheng, and Yamaura) does not here or elsewhere teach or suggest that the electronic device being configured would send a synchronization request as required by the claim. Rather, this portion of the cited art simply describes how information is exchanged between a workstation's browser (i.e., a user interface) and a database. Carcerano col. 9, lines 34-37. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 7-11, and 16 are allowable over the cited art.

Amended independent claim 20 recites "receiving a synchronization request from the electronic device; and providing device configuration information from the database to the electronic device in response to the synchronization request." The examiner relies on the previously-cited portion of Carcerano to anticipate this limitation. As noted above, that portion of the cited art only describes how information is exchanged between a workstation's browser (i.e., a user interface) and a database. The cited art does not here or elsewhere teach or suggest that the electronic device sends a synchronization request as required by the claim. For at least this reason, independent claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-22, 24-25, and 30 are allowable over the cited art.

III. NEWLY ADDED CLAIM

Independent claim 34 recites in part "providing device configuration information from [an online] database to the electronic device, wherein the electronic device is one of a set consisting of: alarm clocks, answering machines, and sprinkler systems." Applicants can find no teaching of these limitations in the cited art. For at least this reason, independent claim 34 is allowable over the cited art.

IV. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The examiner indicated that claims 8-15, 17-19, 25-29, and 31-33 would be allowable if rewritten to avoid dependence on rejected base claims. Claims 12, 17, 26, and 31 have been amended into independent form, placing claims 12-

Appl. No. 09/822,167
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 12, 2005

15, 17-19, 26-29, and 31-33 in condition for allowance. Applicants have deferred amending claims 8-11 and 25 pending the prosecution outcome on their base claims.

V. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Krueger
PTO Reg. No. 42,771
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400